



# **A Critical Examination of the Navy's Advertising Strategy, Assessment Measures, and Practices**

**Gregory W. Boller  
Tanja F. Blackstone**

**20020916 112**



## **A Critical Examination of the Navy's Advertising Strategy, Assessment Measures, and Practices**

Gregory W. Boller  
University of Memphis

Tanja F. Blackstone  
Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology

Reviewed and Approved by  
David L. Alderton  
Institute for Selection and Classification

Released by  
Murray W. Rowe  
Director

Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology  
Navy Personnel Command  
5720 Integrity Drive  
Millington, TN 38055-1300

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> 31-08-2002		<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> Technical Note		<b>3. DATES COVERED (From - To)</b>	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> A Critical Examination of the Navy's Advertising Strategy, Assessment Measures, and Practices				<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Gregory Boller, Tanja Blackstone				<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b>	
				<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>  Navy Personnel Research, Studies, and Technology 5720 Integrity Drive Millington, TN 38055-1300				<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b> NPRST-TN-02-2	
<b>9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b>				<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b>	
				<b>11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)</b>	
<b>12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
<b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>					
<b>14. ABSTRACT</b> The Navy's advertising strategy and advertising assessment practices (from October 1998-February 2001) are critically examined. In addition, the advertising creative approach and tactics used by the Marine Corps for their FY00 advertising campaign are benchmarked for comparison to the advertising creative approach and tactics used by the Navy for the same period. Finally, alternative measures of advertising effectiveness are proposed. The findings of this study suggest that the Navy's advertising assessment and effectiveness practices need to be greatly improved. At present, the Navy has no internal practices for assessing the persuasiveness of its advertising, and no viable research mechanism for designing and assessing their advertising creative. The findings in this research are based directly on data obtained from the Navy and its advertising agency, BBDO Worldwide, Inc. In the fall of 2000 the Navy obtained a new advertising agency, Campbell-Ewald, Inc. It is recommended that the Navy experiment and implement some of the specific recommendations of this research as					
<b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b>					
<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>			<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b>	<b>19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b>
<b>a. REPORT</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>c. THIS PAGE</b> UNCLASSIFIED	UNLIMITED	25	Kay Bailey
					<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)</b> 901-874-2115 (DSN 882)

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)  
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

## **Foreword**

The Navy's advertising strategy and advertising assessment practices (October 1998—February 2001) are critically examined. In addition, the advertising creative approach and tactics used by the Marine Corps for their FY00 advertising campaign are benchmarked for comparison to the advertising creative approach and tactics used by the Navy for the same period. Finally, alternative measures of advertising effectiveness are proposed. The findings of this study suggest that the Navy's advertising assessment and effectiveness practices need to be greatly improved. At present, the Navy has no internal practices for assessing the persuasiveness of its advertising, and no viable research mechanism for designing and assessing their advertising creative. The findings in this research are based directly on data obtained from the Navy and its advertising agency, BBDO Worldwide, Inc. In the fall of 2000 the Navy obtained a new advertising agency, Campbell-Ewald, Inc. It is recommended that the Navy experiment and implement some of the specific recommendations of this research as new campaigns are developed with its agency.

Murray W. Rowe  
Director

## Table of Contents

Background and Method.....	1
Background and Objectives .....	1
Scope/Limitations/Constraints.....	1
Method .....	2
Evaluate the Navy's Recent and Current Advertising Strategy .....	3
Overview .....	3
Findings .....	3
Positioning .....	3
Audience .....	6
Creative .....	7
Implementation .....	9
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	10
Evaluate the Navy's Recent and Current Advertising Assessment	
Practices and Measures.....	11
Overview .....	11
Findings .....	11
Effectiveness Measures.....	11
Assessment Practices .....	14
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	15
Benchmark the Best Creative Practices Used in Military Advertising.....	17
Overview .....	17
Findings .....	17
Positioning .....	17
Creative Appeal .....	18
A Powerful Symbol.....	18
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	19
Propose Alternative Advertising Effectiveness Measures and Procedures .....	19
Overview.....	19
Findings .....	20
Initial Considerations .....	20
Alternative Measures .....	21
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	22
Appendix: Measures of Advertising Effectiveness.....	A-0

# **Background and Method**

## **Background and Objectives**

Recruiting qualified young people to join the Navy has been particularly difficult in the last several years. In a period of economic growth and low unemployment, it has been increasingly difficult for Commander, Navy Recruiting Command (CNRC) to meet its accession mission. During this same time period the Youth Attitude Tracking Study (YATS) results show that the enlistment propensity of young people has declined, with more high school graduates indicating a desire to go to college. The strong economy has contributed to reduced retention, exacerbating the recruiting problem by increasing the number of young people that need to be brought into the Navy to replace losses.

Advertising is a large (in terms of dollar expenditures), visible, and important part of recruiting. Commander, Navy Recruiting Command (CNRC) spends millions of dollars each year on advertising to get its message out to young men and women. The Navy has historically had an image problem and has not effectively presented itself to the public/target market through advertising. Significant turnover in slogans and campaigns, and inconsistent advertising spending practices are contributors to the current problem. Both the Navy and BBDO Worldwide, Inc., (the Navy's advertising agency), made a concerted effort during the FY99 and FY00 campaigns to reverse these trends.

Based on the YATS<sup>1</sup>, the Navy falls behind the Army and Marine Corps in unaided recall for military service advertising. Only the Air Force, who until just recently hasn't used paid advertising as a tool to solicit recruits, shows lower recall than the Navy. The Navy also has the lowest recognition of service advertising slogans ("You and the Navy, Full Speed Ahead" and "Let the Journey Begin") of the four branches of service.

Recent research on the impact of advertising on the propensity to enlist is limited to research conducted by RAND and BBDO Worldwide, Inc. Existing research is either dated or focuses on the impact of advertising on the aggregate supply of new recruits. To a large extent, existing research tends to ignore basic questions concerning the appropriateness and effectiveness of positioning concepts and advertising creative on selected target audiences.

## **Scope/Limitations/Constraints**

The purpose of this research effort is to critically analyze the Navy's advertising strategy, and advertising assessment practices and measures employed during FY99–FY00, as well as suggest alternative measures of advertising effectiveness. This research effort will ideally serve as an informational source for CNRC with respect to the current state of their advertising practices. In addition, this research effort should provide the

---

<sup>1</sup> YATS was a Department of Defense (DoD) study conducted annually from 1975-1999. It was administered to 16 to 24 year-old American youth and collected information on propensity for military service, advertising awareness, slogan recognition, media habits and Internet usage from 30-minute interviews.

basis upon which the Navy can seek to develop their advertising assessment processes into a future advertising decision support system.

The specific research objectives are as follows:

1. To evaluate the Navy's advertising strategy during FY99–FY00.
2. To evaluate the Navy's advertising assessment practices and measures during FY99-FY00.
3. To benchmark the best creative practices used in military advertising.
4. To propose alternative advertising effectiveness measures and procedures.

The materials analyzed for this project are limited to selected documents including the FY 1998 CNRC Ad Plan, the FY 1998 initial media schedule, an October 1998 focus group study, and various newspaper articles from sundry sources. Despite requests for the FY 1999, FY 2000, and FY 2001 Ad Plans and Media Plans, these were not available to this analysis.

## **Method**

This research study will use three primary methodologies: 1) Secondary Data Collection, 2) Direct Personal Interviewing and Observation, and 3) Rhetorical Criticism. To accomplish each of the research objectives, secondary data collection will be heavily employed. This will involve collecting and analyzing prior scientific studies in the areas of advertising and marketing communications effectiveness, as well as complex decision-making. These studies will largely be drawn from the disciplines of advertising, marketing, consumer research, and psychology. Additionally, prior scientific studies conducted for the military, as well as advertising and consumer trend data from industry will also be examined.

To accomplish objectives one and two, personal interviews with the BBDO Worldwide, Inc., (the Navy's advertising agency), CNRC advertising representatives and other Navy personnel will be conducted. These interviews will be conducted one-to-one, in a directed-interview fashion. Additionally, supporting data from BBDO Worldwide, Inc. will be collected as available.

To accomplish objectives one and three, rhetorical criticism methods will be employed. Rhetorical criticism is an interpretive methodology that seeks to "read-out" alternative meanings presented in persuasive communications. The objective of this methodology is not to seek the "true meaning" of a persuasive communication, but rather to provide a foundation for dialog and debate regarding alternative readings of the meaning of the persuasive communication.

# Evaluate the Navy's FY99-FY00 Advertising Strategy

## Overview

The most important aspects of any advertising strategy include, 1) Positioning and 2) Creative. Unfortunately, we find that CNRC spends very little time or efforts planning these two vital aspects of advertising strategy. Instead, the bulk of CNRC's time and effort seems to be spent deciding how to allocate advertising budget amounts to various media selections.

A key element of any advertising strategy is, at its core, a creative and audience-focused process. Advertising strategists continually analyze, consider, and evaluate their creative messages in terms of their ability to produce persuasive effects in their audiences. The prime objective of an advertising strategist is to create meanings—vocabularies for thinking about and talking about their products that are superior to those provided by competitive advertising strategists.

## Findings

### Positioning

Broadly defined, positioning refers to the meanings owned by one brand, unique and distinct from the meanings owned by competing brands, in the minds of the target audience (consumers, customers, and/or influencers). A brand's positioning is generally conveyed through unique poetic transformations (usually found in headers, tags, and slogans accompanying marketing communications), unique imagery (visual and/or auditory), and unique value propositions (usually found in specific benefit claims). Effective positioning provides the brand with a "personality" that is uniquely different and uniquely valuable from competing brands. Positioning is a key aspect of any comprehensive advertising campaign.

**Positioning Through The Slogan.** The Navy's current positioning, as conveyed through its slogan, is ill defined. The current slogan, "Let The Journey Begin," enjoys a lackluster recall among those prospects aware of the current Navy ad campaign (eight percent recall according to the 1999 Navy Advertising Effectiveness Study (NAES) report and ten percent recall according to the 2000 NAES report by BBDO). Given that 67 percent of the Navy's prospects are aware (unaided) of the current ad campaign (according to the 2000 NAES report), this suggests that a mere 6.7 percent of the target prospects can correctly recall the Navy's slogan. We strongly suspect that this poor recall performance has little to do with the Navy's overall advertising spending levels (or lack thereof according to the agency), but rather may have more to do with the obtuse meaning of the phrase, "Let the Journey Begin."

In our analysis of the slogan we determined that "Let The Journey Begin" is essentially a mass pronouncement signaling the start of some great event (cf. "Let The Games Begin"). But what is this "journey?" Is this the journey of "life," one's "career," or one's "education?" The meaning of this phrase is terribly ambiguous, perhaps



purposely, and thus difficult to comprehend within the context of making a decision to join the Navy over other branches of the military or taking other life options.

Compare the Navy slogan with those recently used by the Army (Be All That You Can Be) and the Air Force (Aim High). Both the Army and the Air Force use personal achievement imperatives. In so doing, they issue a personal challenge to the prospect; they highlight the fact that the decision to join a military service branch is intensely personal, and achievement-motivated (a key aspect of the value proposition). The slogan used by the Marine Corps (The Few. The Proud. The Marines.) is a group identity declaration, with overt elitism overtones. Encouraging identification with an elite reference group is well understood by marketing professionals to be a powerful motivational tactic.

In January 2001, the Army and the Air Force began aggressively airing new television ads, showcasing the change in slogans for these two service branches. The Army's new slogan is "An Army of One," and the Air Force's new slogan is "No One Comes Close."

"An Army of One" marks a subtle yet significant shift in value positioning from personal achievement challenges to declarations of the source of personal power and strength. Nearly 50 years ago, noted sociologist C. Wright Mills argued that "power" is not within a person, but rather acquired by virtue of a person's membership with large, resource-laden institutions. Thus, "An Army of One" underscores an inference that the power of the Army proper will make an individual powerful—an army unto him or herself.

The Air Force's new slogan "No One Comes Close" marks a distinctive move in value positioning toward that used by the Marine Corps. The slogans of both service branches contain strong elitism overtones. But where "The Few. The Proud. The Marines" underscores elite group membership, "No One Comes Close" highlights elite performance. The Air Force reinforces this meaning with impressive array of advertising imagery showcasing their high-performance technology.

In February 2001 the Navy changed their slogan from "Let the Journey Begin" to "Accelerate your Life."

**Positioning Through Imagery.** When considering the imagery used by the Navy to establish their positioning, it is most instructive in the present context to consider what images are not used in their current advertising campaign. According to the 1999 NAES report by BBDO, the second most frequent reason listed for joining the Navy was "interest in the sea, ships and sailing." Yet with two notable exceptions (the Navy SEALs ad and the 12 minute recruiting video), we find few images associated with the Navy's seafaring mission in the advertising campaign we analyzed. Historically, "command of the high-seas" provided the Navy with an identity that was unique among service branches, and unique among other opportunities open to prospects, yet this simple fact is not leveraged in the Navy's current positioning imagery.

When CNRC was queried on the lack of seafaring imagery in their current advertising, we found they were advised by BBDO that seafaring imagery reminded male prospects of the loneliness, isolation, and lack of female companionship associated with

sea-duty. BBDO made this recommendation based on focus group research conducted during FY99. Thus, most of the seafaring imagery was purposely excluded from the FY00 advertising campaign.

Another area of imagery missing from the advertising campaigns analyzed is the history of the Navy and associated naval traditions. This is particularly surprising given that the Navy's core values (honor, courage, and commitment), conspicuous throughout all of the Navy's recruiting communication, demand historical elaboration for their persuasive effect. One historical image was featured in an advertisement in the current campaign that is noteworthy. The ad was entitled "Travel," and featured a 3.5 second aerial shot of the Arizona Memorial. While most of the prospects viewing this may not recognize the shot as the Arizona Memorial, for those who do recognize the Arizona Memorial, it would be instructive to learn what meanings they derive from an image symbolizing such a tragic loss of life.

**Positioning Through Internet Information.** In analyzing the Navy's recruiting web site, navyjobs.com<sup>2</sup>, it presented an interesting array of positioning contradictions. The web site's name clearly positions the Navy as a place to obtain "jobs," versus "careers." This short-term aspect of "jobs" is generally inconsistent with the longer-term meaning of "journey" included in the Navy's slogan.

Exploring the site's "About The Navy," section we find the following text:

**Today's Navy is a forward-thinking, technologically advanced, worldwide team of highly trained professionals serving their country at sea, under the sea, on land and in the air.**

**In today's Navy, you can learn high-tech skills in one of more than 60 job fields...The Navy can put you on the leading edge of technology, and you don't need experience to start. Bring honor, courage and commitment, and let the journey begin.**

In the first paragraph, viewers are offered the primary mission of the Navy—"service to country." However, rather than elaborating upon the personal benefits associated with "service to country," viewers are instead offered a jobs-benefit claim in the second paragraph. Here, we begin to understand that the "journey" component of the Navy's positioning consists of learning high-tech skills.

Exploring the site's "High School Student or Graduate," section we find three primary reasons (benefits) listed for joining the Navy: 1) Jobs and Training, 2) Money for College, and 3) Travel. Viewers are thus encouraged to believe that along the "journey" of learning high-tech skills, one can acquire opportunities to travel as well as money for a college education. Although the three benefits listed may be desirable to prospects, it is important to note in terms of positioning that they are not unique to the Navy. Moreover, it is not clear how acquiring jobs and training, money for college, and opportunities to travel constitute "service to country."

---

<sup>2</sup> The Navy Internet site navyjobs.com was revised and a new site was launched 15 March 2001 as navy.com.

Given the Navy's technology focus as a prime component of the "journey" positioning, we explored the site's hyperlink "15 and Under," section and "Play 'The Mission'," section. The graphics, audio, and gameplay of this short recruiting video game are amazingly below what is industry standard in today's video game market. Moreover, the quality of "The Mission" is inconsistent with the quality and sophistication of the graphic animation sequence on the navyjobs.com homepage. While "The Mission" is appropriate for children ages 15 and under, teen-agers will likely find it dull and boring. In terms of positioning however, the sub-par quality of the videogame entitled "The Mission" symbolically suggests that the Navy may itself be sub-par and that "service to country" may be relatively unimportant.

### **Audience**

Despite repeated requests for internal and/or independent segmentation and targeting studies, CNRC could not provide these for analysis.

Based upon the limited information available to us, we are only able to discern four primary audience groupings—Male Caucasians, Male African-American, Male Hispanic, and Female. That is, the Navy primarily uses ethnicity and gender to define its target audience groupings, and guide its creative development. Secondarily, the Navy uses age and vocational interest as audience grouping criteria, although their usage is primarily evident on the Navy's recruiting web site.

There is no evidence the Navy uses alternative segmentation and targeting criteria (e.g., geographic; Values and Lifestyles (VALS); Attitudes, Interests, and Opinions (AIO)).

Using Navy enlistment data (PRIDE database) from FY1998—First half FY2000 we demonstrate the potential value of geographic segmentation and targeting. The geographically identified enlistment data was adjusted, by state, for population density. The resulting data consisted of a tally of Navy enlistments, per capita, by state, over the last 2.5 years. These data are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. U.S. Navy Geographic Enlistment Draw**

<b>Top 10 Drawing States for Navy Enlistments</b>	
State	Enlistments/Capita
MT	744
NV	537
TX	461
AZ	430
LA	424
NM	413
MO	409
OR	395
CO	385
WY	378
<b>Bottom 10 Drawing States for Navy Enlistment</b>	
State	Enlistments/Capita
RI	186
MD	166
WI	148
VT	137
CT	126
MA	104
NH	95
DE	78
AK	39
NJ	9

As seen in Table 1, there are pronounced geographical groupings, in terms of enlistment draw, across the United States. On a per capita basis, the Navy clearly draws more heavily from the Western states than from the New England states. The observation that there appear to be regional differences in Navy enlistment propensity is worthy of further research attention.

### **Creative**

The creative analyzed for this project is limited to the Navy's FY 1999–FY 2000 national television advertising (General Awareness and DRTV Spots). Despite repeated requests for print advertisements, radio advertisements, direct mail, and advertisements from FY 1997–FY 1998, CNRC was unable to provide these for analysis.

As stated in the FY 1998 CNRC Ad Plan, the creative strategy was designed to create the following impression among prime prospects: "Your Navy service will be the most **stimulating, challenging experience** of *your* life. It will **excite you, train you** and **prepare you** for tomorrow like nothing else. The Navy is a proud organization whose

core values—**honor, courage and commitment**—build enduring character and pride.” Unfortunately, the creative execution of the “Let The Journey Begin” campaign departed significantly from the stated strategy.

The campaign’s six General Awareness spots (“Band,” “Education,” “Homecoming,” “Travel,” “SEAL,” and “Life After the Navy”) and the two DRTV spots (“This is My Navy,” and “Where You Need to Be”) were all filmed as testimonials—thus greatly diminishing the possibility of creating strong feelings of personal relevance (as required by the objectives of the written ad strategy (i.e., “you” and “your”)). In order for testimonials to be perceived as believable to audience members, the characters in the ads must either 1) present themselves as “experts” on the advertised topic, or 2) present themselves as similar to the audience members in terms of interests, attitudes, and value orientations (i.e., audience members feel identification with the ad characters). The agency apparently chose an identification tactic. But rather than work higher-levels of identification (e.g., interests, attitudes, and value orientations), they instead chose to work lower-levels of identification through gender, race, and ethnic background.

According to the Navy’s stated creative strategy, the campaign ads should have been designed to convey “stimulation,” “excitement,” and a strong sense of “challenge.” Strangely, the campaign ads appeared to have been created to convey just the opposite. The entire tone of the campaign ads is quite sedentary. The scoring of the ads is quite unremarkable—sleepy, in fact. We were quite surprised to find an almost complete lack of assertiveness in the creative executions – surprised because these were advertisements for the Navy.

The influence of superordinate authority on creative execution is also found in the General Awareness spot entitled “Travel.” In this 30-second spot, which features the travel opportunities available in the Navy, a full four seconds is devoted to an aerial shot of the Arizona Memorial. Although this is a significant and moving American monument, we found it odd that this image would be so prominently featured in a Navy recruiting advertisement. It is an odd image to use in a recruiting ad because: 1) it is doubtful that members of the target audience will actually recognize the Arizona Memorial, and 2) even if members of the target audience do recognize the Arizona Memorial, it is doubtful that the associated imagery of death and destruction would be particularly powerful motivators of enlistment propensity. The effectiveness of a rallying-cry appeal (e.g., “Remember the Alamo”) is largely dependent upon 1) the target audience’s full understanding and appreciation of the rallying event, and 2) their ability to extract a measure of revenge on those perceived responsible for the rallying event.

The overall thrust of the creative execution for the “Let The Journey Begin” campaign is centered on “jobs” in the Navy and “educational support” from the Navy. This thrust is a clear departure from the stated advertising strategy in the CNRC FY 1998 Ad Plan. Although we refer to the FY98 Ad Plan we were told that the FY 1999 Ad Plan and FY 2000 Ad Plan employed the same creative strategy. Thus, the radical departure in creative from the stated Ad Plans is surprising and unclear.

There is one additional finding concerning the Navy’s ad creative—“General Awareness” versus “Direct Response.” While analyzing the Navy’s General Awareness spots, we noted that the Navy’s slogan tag (“Let The Journey Begin”) and 1-800-USA-

NAVY recruiting number were on-screen for no more than two seconds—a questionable duration if memory registration is desired. When this finding was discussed with agency representatives<sup>3</sup> they responded that “The duration of the tag on the General Awareness spots is irrelevant—they’re designed to create ‘general awareness,’ not ‘direct response’.”

### Implementation

The implementation materials analyzed for this project are limited to selected documents including the FY 1998 CNRC Ad Plan, the FY 1998 initial media schedule, an October 1998 focus group study, and various newspaper articles from sundry sources. Despite repeated requests for FY 1999, FY 2000, and FY 2001 Ad Plans and Media Plans, none were provided by Code 80.

The Navy undertook a massive shift in creative strategy, based on BBDO’s strategic exploratory, a 1998 focus group study, that partially examined the FY 98 ads. One focus group finding that particularly interested Navy advertising personnel and their agency was a “mention” that images of ships-at-sea connote feelings of “isolation,” and “loneliness.” This finding motivated the decision to remove most of the seafaring imagery from the Navy’s television advertising. A rough timeline of events surrounding the shift in creative strategy is listed in Table 2.

**Table 2. Ad Strategy Timeline**

<u>Date</u>	<u>Event</u>
Mar. 6, 1998	CNRC Advertising Plan (Code 80): Fiscal Year 1998
Apr. 14, 1998	FY 98 Flowchart [Media Schedule] from BBDO
Oct. 13, 1998	A Qualitative Research Study on Navy Recruiting
Feb. 11, 1999	Scripts for the new TV campaign (FY 99)
Jul. 1999	1999 NAES Topline (FY 98 ads)
Sep. 20, 1999	1999 NAES (FY 98 ads)

What is particularly important to note in Table 2 is that the new creative strategy was developed before the Navy Advertising Effectiveness Study (NAES) results arrived in the summer of 1999—showing the previous campaign was having desirable effects. We were told the change was a CNRC command decision.

<sup>3</sup> From one of the Navy’s ad agencies (Rapp-Collins)

## Conclusions and Recommendations

In light of the aforementioned findings, the following recommendations are offered.

- **The Navy should place less emphasis on creating “general awareness,” and place more emphasis on motivating specific behavioral responses from their target audiences.**

Generally speaking, the Navy does not appear to have an “awareness problem” (i.e., most Americans are aware that this country maintains Naval forces). Therefore to address the “recruiting problem,” special attention must be devoted to creating advertising that prompts specific, measurable behaviors along potential recruits’ enlistment decision-chain (e.g., calling 1-800-USA-NAVY, contacting a local recruiter, visiting the Navy’s recruiting web site).

- **The Navy should make creative strategy and creative execution an integral part of their strategic planning.**

At present, the Navy appears to leave creative strategy and issues pertaining to creative execution to their advertising agencies, and superordinate command authority. However, it is imperative that those responsible for advertising management within CNRC should also be responsible for planning and implementing creative strategy. Without superior creative strategy, other advertising decisions (e.g., budget allocation, media mix, etc.) will ultimately be for naught.

- **If superordinate authority figures are responsible for creative execution decisions, it is imperative that they be included in the Navy’s strategic ad planning.**

Apparently, the influence of superordinate command authority on issues pertaining to creative execution is substantial. Since these superordinate authority figures have a sincere interest, as well as noted expertise, in recruiting advertising, we recommend that these individuals be asked to actively participate in the Navy’s strategic ad planning sessions. We believe that this would raise the level of expertise “at the planning table,” and add further layers of accountability to the strategy process.

- **The Navy should make serious investments in audience research, and use the results of this research to guide the development of the advertising creative and positioning.**

At present, the Navy does not direct audience research specifically to aid in creative strategy or positioning decisions. Moreover, the source of the “inspiration” behind the Navy’s past and current advertising creative is unknown. Advertising creative should be based on sound, scientific audience research instead of the whims and fancies of advertising creative directors and/or superordinate authority figures. This audience research should, to ensure proper synergy for CNRC’s strategic objectives, be initiated and directed by CNRC.

- **The Navy should coordinate all aspects of the marketing communication mix to create consistency-of-message.**

At present, the Navy's overall marketing communication mix contains inconsistencies across the various advertising and positioning messages. These inconsistencies can create audience confusion and undermine the overall advertising strategy. Much of this problem can be corrected internally at CNRC.

## **Evaluate the Navy's Recent and Current Advertising Assessment Practices and Measures**

### **Overview**

At present, the Navy primarily relies upon its advertising agency to assess the effectiveness of its advertising. That is to say, with the exception of this analysis, CNRC does not independently assess the effectiveness of its advertising practices. Moreover, under this system, CNRC does not have much, if any, input into the selection of advertising effectiveness metrics—the decision as to the appropriateness of effectiveness metrics seems to have been left at the discretion of their agency.

### **Findings**

#### **Effectiveness Measures**

During the course of this research, we found that the Navy primarily relies upon measures taken by their ad agency in the annual NAES (Navy Advertising Effectiveness Study) report to assess the effectiveness of their advertising. These measures are as follows:

- Navy ad spending; as a percentage of total service advertising (share-of-voice)
- Navy ad awareness (unaided and aided)
- Navy ad slogan recall
- Among those aware of Navy ads, percentage who "took action"
- Service branch imagery (attitude toward service branches; most preferred branch)
- Life Goals

Additionally, the Navy also uses their monthly reports from the Local Effective Accession Delivery System (LEADS) database in an attempt to source Program Eligible Leads (PELs) to specific media vehicles. In general CNRC attempts to ascertain the total number of PELs generated by their advertising efforts.

**Ad Spending.** Ad spending is not a typical measure of advertising effectiveness. It is unclear why BBDO chose this as a metric and reported comparative ad spending levels across the four service branches in NAES. Overall ad spending, or share-of-voice ad spending is not an advertising effectiveness measure. Clearly, an overriding assumption is that increased levels of ad spending will result in measurable increases in marketing outcomes (e.g., PELs). However, the relationship between level of ad spending and the



level of desirable market behavior is dependent upon the persuasive effectiveness of the advertising creative as well as the distribution effectiveness of the advertising media plan. For example, increased ad spending to place poor creative may lead to an inverse relationship between ad spending and market behavior.

**Ad Awareness.** One of the primary measures used by BBDO to assess the effectiveness of their advertising is overall Ad Awareness (both aided and unaided). The percentage of interviewed individuals (during the data collection period) who state that they recall seeing or hearing a Navy ad “recently,” constitutes the Ad Awareness measure.

Ad Awareness is both a measure of media implementation (i.e., achieving desired reach) and the ability of the ad-creative to cut-through competing ad clutter. Ad Awareness should not be treated as a measure of the persuasive effectiveness of the advertising. Ad Awareness is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition to establish persuasive import.

The 2000 NAES Report indicates a sample Ad Awareness = 0.77 (statistically significant increases over the 1999 NAES Report among Caucasian and Hispanic members of the target audience).

**Slogan Recall.** Another primary measure used by the Navy’s advertising agency to assess the effectiveness of their advertising is Slogan Recall. The percentage of interviewed individuals (during the data collection period) who correctly recall the Navy’s slogan (Let the Journey Begin) constitutes the Slogan Recall measure.

Slogan Recall is both a measure of media implementation (i.e., achieving desired frequency) and the ability of the slogan-creative to cut through competing slogan clutter. Slogan Recall, by itself, should not be treated as a measure of the persuasive effectiveness of the advertising or the viability of the positioning reflected in the slogan.

The 2000 NAES Report indicates a sample Slogan Recall = 0.10 (a statistically insignificant increase over the 1999 NAES Report indicating Slogan Recall = 0.08).

The fact that the Navy’s Slogan Recall is out-of-line with the Navy’s Ad Awareness suggests a potential problem with the current slogan—it is not particularly memorable. There are numerous possible explanations for the lack of slogan memorability. However, since the Navy does not currently collect any data on the persuasive import of its slogan or the viability of its positioning, any explanation offered at this time would be speculative.

**Took Action.** One of the “acid-test” measures of Navy advertising effectiveness is whether or not the advertising prompted a member of the target audience to “take action” (e.g., contact a recruiter or seek further information about joining the Navy). The percentage of interviewed individuals (during the data collection period) who stated “Yes” to the question, “Did the advertising you saw or heard from the Navy cause you to contact a recruiter or seek further information about joining the Navy?” constitutes the “Took Action” measure.

The 2000 NAES Report indicates a sample Took Action = 0.11 (a statistically significant decrease over the 1999 NAES Report indicating Took Action = 0.15).

Taken together with the 2000 NAES Ad Awareness findings, the recent decline in the percent of the target audience who believe that the Navy's advertising prompted them to take further action indicates a serious problem with the Navy's FY00 advertising campaign. The data concerning the persuasive effectiveness of the Navy's advertising suggests that the current ad campaign may be less-than-effective in motivating members of the target audience to engage the recruiting process (i.e., obtain additional recruiting information and to seek a meeting with a Navy recruiter).

**Imagery.** BBDO measures "imagery" through a series of questions designed to elicit respondent preferences for military service branches. What BBDO refers to as "imagery" is not "image" in the strict sense of the word, and should be rephrased as "service branch preferences."

The percentage of interviewed individuals (during the data collection period) who claim that the Navy is their most preferred branch of military service constitutes the measure of Positive Navy Imagery. The percentage of interviewed individuals (during the data collection period) who claim that the Navy is their least preferred branch of military service constitutes the measure of Negative Navy Imagery.

The 2000 NAES Report indicates a sample Positive Navy Imagery = 0.22 (a statistically insignificant increase over the 1999 NAES Report indicating Positive Navy Imagery = 0.19). The 2000 NAES Report indicates a sample Negative Navy Imagery = 0.18 (a statistically significant increase over the 1999 NAES Report indicating Negative Navy Imagery = 0.13).

Taken together with the recent decline in the percent of the target audience who believe that the Navy's advertising prompted them to take further action, the recent increase in the percent of the target audience who see the Navy as their least preferred branch of the military suggests a serious problem with the FY00 advertising campaign. Specifically, these findings suggest that competitive marketing efforts on the part of other service branches may be successfully drawing recruits away from the Navy.

**Life Goals.** BBDO, as part of the NAES report, routinely tracks the relative importance (in the minds of the target audience) of various life goals. Interviewed individuals are asked to state the level of importance they associate with a battery of life-goals statements (e.g., "To have opportunity for adventure and excitement;" "To have a job which helps you pay for college education;" "To be associated with an organization with the core values of honor, courage and commitment.").

Strictly speaking, these items are not advertising effectiveness measures. The Navy could, if desired, change these into ad effectiveness measures by transforming them into Navy-belief statements (e.g., "The Navy provides you with the opportunity for adventure and excitement;" "The Navy is a job that helps you pay for a college education;" "The Navy is an organization with the core values of honor, courage and commitment.").

These items would then provide a measure of the degree to which target audience individuals believe key benefit claims stated in the advertising.

**PELs.** Annual PEL production is the primary measure of advertising effectiveness used by CNRC. A PEL is an individual who has been pre-screened by telephone operators to meet various basic recruiting criteria (e.g., the use of all limbs and eyes), and

who expresses an interest in contacting a local Navy recruiter or obtaining additional information. CNRC believes that the primary mission of advertising is to produce PELs for its Navy recruiters. Strong annual PEL production indicates that their advertising campaign is "effective," changes in recruiting standards, number of recruiters in the field, and confounding Navy web site "hits" with PELs notwithstanding.

During a June 2000 ad strategy meeting for FY 2001, CNRC was asked to explain the nearly 100 percent increase in PEL production over the previous year. They attributed it to their advertising efforts. However, there is no data to substantiate that claim.

In order to use PELs as an objective measure of advertising effectiveness, the Navy must define as an objective that their advertising efforts is to produce changes in behavior (i.e., motivating members of the target audience to "take action" in the form of contacting the Navy for additional information or to meet with a recruiter). Presently, the Navy places the majority of its advertising effort in creating "general awareness" of Navy advertising and the benefits of Navy employment. Secondly, the Navy must be able to source the PEL production to advertising exposure, in general, and specific media vehicles, in particular. Most importantly, the Navy must account for various other causal factors affecting PEL production when attempting to estimate the effects of advertising on PEL production (e.g., number of field recruiters, changes in recruiting standards, and changes in standards regarding how PELs are tallied). Sourcing PEL production to advertising efforts (especially media vehicles) will be particularly difficult given the measurement problems discussed below.

### **Assessment Practices**

**The NAES Report.** The NAES Report represents the most comprehensive effort to assess the quality and effectiveness of the Navy's advertising. Unfortunately, the NAES Report is produced toward the very end of the ad planning cycle for the next fiscal year. For example, during the final phases of ad planning for FY 2001, CNRC did not have access to advertising effectiveness data to guide their decision-making. Even after the NAES 2000 Topline results were available to CNRC in late July 2000, as of September 2000, the results were not used in developing the advertising strategy for FY 2001.

Despite the comprehensive nature of the NAES Report, the Navy should exercise caution in interpreting the findings within. The NAES Report contains agency bias. For example, the following statement was taken from the 2000 NAES Report: "African-American males did show a directional increase in claims that Navy advertising prompted them to take action." The term "directional increase" means that the 2000 sample percentage of African-American males who "Took Action" was higher than the 1999 sample percentage of African-American males who "Took Action." The difference in sample percentages is not statistically significant, and thus should be treated as "no-movement," in either direction. To report a finding that is best attributable to sampling error as a "directional increase" is deceptive.

A report of the Navy's advertising effectiveness must be free from agency bias if the results are to be ascribed any measure of authenticity and credibility. Perhaps this is best achieved by using independent researchers to administer, analyze, and disseminate

advertising effectiveness measurement, with no vested interest or relationship with the Navy's advertising agency or the Navy itself.

**The LEADS Data.** The LEADS data arrives as a hard-copy report, detailing the PELs produced-by-media vehicle, once a month<sup>4</sup>. Given the onerous volume of paper in this hard-copy report, CNRC did not find this data to be user-friendly or helpful to their decision-making. In addition, the LEADS data is reported in "cross-sectional" format—no attempt is currently made to organize this data into a longitudinal tracking format, and as such is very limited in its usefulness.

Perhaps the most serious problem with the LEADS data (vehicle-sourced PELs) concerns the clear measurement error we discovered during this project. Throughout August 2000, we made 30 phone calls to the Navy's 1-800-USA-NAVY number. Upon reaching the telephone operator, we were asked if we wanted the number of a local Navy recruiter. After saying "Yes," we were then asked where we heard about the 1-800-USA-NAVY phone number. In each case, we replied, "Some ad...." In none of the 30 instances did the telephone operators attempt to probe the source of the advertising (neither general media type nor specific media vehicle). Moreover, the telephone operators did not pre-screen in an attempt to "qualify" us as "program eligible leads." This raises very serious questions regarding the quality of the LEADS data as well as the overall measure of PEL production used by CNRC as their primary assessment of advertising effectiveness.

**Internal Analysis and Dissemination.** As noted, CNRC does not perform any systematic, formal analysis of advertising effectiveness internally. Instead, they rely upon anecdotal evidence of advertising effectiveness, including year-to-date (YTD) PEL production reports, YTD recruiting quota reports and briefings from their own advertising agencies.

The yearly NAES Reports are not widely used. Although the 2000 NAES Report might have been useful to CNRC during their FY 2001 ad planning, these results were not used in the FY 2001 ad planning meetings.

Most surprising, there was no evidence of any discussion of advertising effectiveness during CNRC's FY 2001 ad planning meeting. Despite the lack of advertising effectiveness data, there was no apparent interest in even discussing the topic of advertising effectiveness. This finding is important because it suggests that the internal culture of CNRC is not yet advertising-effectiveness oriented.

In February 2001, we discovered that the Navy again changed its advertising strategy and slogan. We asked to examine copies of the new advertisements for the purpose of designing copy test measures for the new campaign. Our request to examine the new Navy advertisements was denied by CNRC.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

In light of the aforementioned findings, the following recommendations are offered.

---

<sup>4</sup> As of the time this report was being written the LEADS process was automated

- The Navy must recreate their internal culture into one that is assertively assessment-oriented.

It is readily apparent that culture within CNRC does not currently encourage or support advertising assessment. In fact, we noted opposition to measuring the effectiveness of advertising. If the Navy truly desires quality, effective advertising products, this aversion to measuring effectiveness must cease. Notable and progressive cultural changes in any organization begin with senior management.

- **The Navy should seek independent assessments of the effectiveness of their advertising.**

At present, the Navy employs its own advertising agency to assess the effectiveness of the advertising that the agency produces. Clearly, this constitutes an undesirable situation. If an advertising agency that is responsible for creating the Navy's recruiting advertising is also responsible for assessing the effectiveness of their own product, can the Navy reasonably expect that agency to deliver unbiased assessment results? We believe that the answer is a resounding, "No." We strongly recommend that the Navy hire outside, third-party researchers to conduct the advertising effectiveness studies, or bring the advertising assessment in-house.

- The Navy should decrease the emphasis on measuring ad awareness and slogan recall in favor of persuasion and behavioral response measures.

Ad awareness and slogan recall are, at best, gross measures of the effectiveness of the media plan. Awareness and recall are not viable measures of the effectiveness of the advertising creative—these measures provide no indication of the persuasive impact of the advertising message. Although media effectiveness measures are important, without associated measures of persuasion or behavioral response, these measures are irrelevant.

- The Navy should ensure that the advertising staff is promptly and fully informed about the effectiveness of the advertising efforts.

At present, CNRC does not appear to systematically distribute or discuss advertising effectiveness results internally. Effectiveness results are an essential feedback component necessary to produce quality advertising. Members of the advertising management team need to analyze these feedback results, discuss them openly, and use them as a basis for continuous improvement.

- The Navy should assess advertising effectiveness more than once a year.

At present, the Navy's primary advertising assessment tool is NAES<sup>5</sup>. This report was historically provided to CNRC once a year. CNRC needs greater flexibility and responsiveness in their advertising management process. Currently, their response-time (effectiveness results—to—changes in advertising efforts) is approximately two years. We recommend that the Navy begin with quarterly effectiveness studies—this should shorten the response-time to approximately six months.

---

<sup>5</sup> As of the writing of this report CNRC has directed its new agency to discontinue the NAES and pursue other assessments of advertising effectiveness.

- The Navy should continue in their efforts to bring advertising effectiveness data and results on-line.

Recently, CNRC began an initiative to bring the LEADS data into an electronic format, with plans to fully launch the LEADS data on-line. Measurement error concerns with the LEADS data notwithstanding, this initiative is a commendable and progressive effort. Any effort to make advertising assessment and effectiveness data more readily available and user-friendly will necessarily result in these data being used by CNRC.

## **Benchmark the Best Creative Practices Used in Military Advertising**

### **Overview**

In this section, we discuss the Marine Corps' recruiting advertising. Although CNRC does not believe that they compete directly with the Marine Corps for new recruits, we believe that the Navy could compete with the Marine Corps, if so desired. CNRC could not present this analysis any evidence suggesting that those recruits who choose to join the Marine Corps are substantively different from those recruits who choose to join the Navy. Differences in recruiting draw between the Marine Corps and the Navy must, in part, be attributed to qualitative differences in advertising.

In terms of creative appeal and overall creative execution, the Marine Corps' advertising is substantially different from other military service branches. While other military service branches primarily stress job training and college assistance benefits, the Marine Corps stresses the personal, emotional benefits of service with the Corps. Is the Marine Corps' advertising "more effective" than the other military service branches' advertising? We cannot answer this question since we have no comparative persuasion data to assess. Can the Navy benefit from an analysis of the Marine Corps' recruiting advertising? Yes, it is important to analyze the creative approaches and tactics used by a potential competitor as part of one's strategic planning.

For this section, we discuss the national television advertising used by the Marine Corps during FY 2000.

### **Findings**

#### **Positioning**

As previously discussed, the Marine Corps positions itself as an elite organization—one where few can "survive" the initiation ordeal. More importantly, the Marine Corps is clearly positioned as an elite group of warriors. Their national advertising is replete with images of weapons, violence, and the forceful dispatching of enemies. No other military service branch so clearly and plainly portrays its primary mission. As positioned, "Marine" is synonymous "Elite Warrior."

## **Creative Appeal**

The advertisements that comprise the Marine Corps' national television campaign all share strong medieval themes. The advertisements are dark and foreboding, and utilize gothic symbolism throughout. The medieval themes are important because they allow the violent imagery to be portrayed as "fantasy," and the dispatching of enemies to be portrayed as "heroic." In two of the ads, the key character is featured as a medieval knight—the King's chosen warrior and a man who "...understands the meaning of honor."

Medieval fantasy and heroic violence are meanings well understood by the Marine Corps' target audience (17–21 year old males). These meanings are core aspects of boyhood imagination that, interestingly enough, carry well into adult life. The medieval imagery and associated meanings are also actively engaged and celebrated by a large percentage of the young male population through action/adventure and role-playing computer/video games. The importance of understanding the entertainment genre preferences of today's youth cannot be understated. If an advertiser can successfully appropriate the imagery and meanings from the target audience's entertainment genres, the effectiveness of conveying the desired meanings to the advertised product will be greatly enhanced.

The dominant appeal in the Marine Corps' advertising is "Spiritual Transformation." Appropriating gothic symbolism (e.g., chants, talisman, monastic robes, altars) helps set up the magical/alchemic backdrop for the ads. Other images and props, including fire, forged steel, armor, white stallions, lightning, and swords are deployed as symbols of power. The key character in each ad must utilize his own strength, assisted by his instruments of power, to overcome adversity. Upon dispatching his enemies and overcoming adversity, the key character is rewarded by spiritually transforming into a Marine. The spiritual transformation is conveyed through the imagery of a lightning bolt striking the character's sword; as the lightning works its way to the hilt of the sword and over the body of the key character, he is transformed into a Marine in full-dress uniform (drum-roll sounds effects complete the final imagery). The transformation, though physically evident, is spiritual because the lightning strikes from "on-high." Moreover, the lightning strikes (energizes) the Marine's key instrument of power—his sword.

## **A Powerful Symbol**

The dominant symbol used throughout the Marine Corps' advertising is the sword. This symbol is significant in a number of ways. First, the sword is a weapon. As such, there is no misunderstanding the fact that Marines wield weapons as warriors. Second, the sword is a primitive weapon, thus helping invoke the mythological, heroic qualities of being a warrior. Third, the sword is the type of weapon that one uses in close combat; it takes great fortitude and courage to kill at such a personal level. Fourth, the sword is a symbol of power; historically, only those with authority and power carry the sword. Finally, the sword itself must undergo an intense transformation—fire, hammering, and tempering.

In contrast the Navy does not use any dominant, powerful symbols in its own advertising. An historic symbol of the Navy is the anchor, yet even this is not utilized for

positioning or advertising effect. The associated meanings of the anchor (ships, stability, strength, security, and safe harbor) could be usefully appropriated for advertising purposes. Perhaps the symbolism of the anchor has outlived its usefulness to the Navy.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

In light of the aforementioned findings, we do NOT recommend that the Navy adopt the same creative approach used by the Marine Corps. The Navy should find its own creative approach and associated symbolism, as defined by its strategic communication objectives. We do, however, recommend the following broad courses of action.

- The Navy should routinely analyze creative approaches and symbolism used by competitors who seek the same pool of recruits.

Evaluating the creative approaches and symbolism used by one's competitors is an essential part of strategic ad planning. If, for example, the Marine Corps is perceived to be the service branch that produces "elite warriors," what is the Navy perceived to produce? If the Marine Corps occupies the "elite warriors" mind-space among potential recruits, what mind-space does the Navy occupy? These are vital questions that the Navy must address if they are to improve their advertising creative and overall positioning.

- The Navy should actively consider the use of powerful symbols to use in the advertising and positioning efforts.

The use of symbols is an efficient and effective way of conveying complex, motivating meanings to an intended target audience. The use of powerful symbols is an essential component of any serious branding strategy. Unfortunately, the Navy does not currently deploy identifiable symbols as part of their advertising creative or positioning strategy.

## Propose Alternative Advertising Effectiveness Measures and Procedures

### Overview

At present, the Navy currently relies upon measures of ad awareness, slogan recall, and PEL production as their primary measures of advertising effectiveness. Little, if any, attempt is made to assess 1) the persuasive impact of their advertising creative or 2) the viability of their positioning concepts and imagery.

Moreover, the Navy does not currently employ a measurement-by-objectives strategy of advertising assessment. For example, the Navy's FY 1998 creative strategy was described to create the following impression among prime prospects: "Your Navy service will be the most **stimulating, challenging experience of your** life. It will **excite you, train you** and **prepare you** for tomorrow like nothing else. The Navy is a proud organization whose core values – **honor, courage and commitment** – build enduring character and pride." If the set of beliefs contained in this creative strategy statement constituted the basis of the communication objectives, it is surprising that the Navy never



actually assessed whether or not these beliefs were in fact created in the minds of their prime prospects.

It is important to note that the phrase "measures of effectiveness" in advertising should not be viewed as synonymous with "analytical techniques." These mathematical techniques can be used to analyze advertising effectiveness measures, but they neither provide nor are, in their own right, measures of effectiveness.

In the present context, "measures of effectiveness" refers to queries and associated response formats designed to elicit data regarding the efficacy of advertising in producing/changing desired mental states, knowledge, and/or behavior in audience members.

## **Findings**

### **Initial Considerations**

Designing useful measures of advertising effectiveness necessarily begins with a thorough understanding of the communication objectives for the advertising campaign. In fact, the only truly useful measures of advertising effectiveness are those that assess the degree to which the communication objectives have been fulfilled.

Communication objectives can be broadly grouped into three types: Transformational, Informational, and Behavioral. Transformational objectives often include creating or changing audience members' a) brand awareness, b) slogan awareness, c) product or brand attitude, d) product or brand involvement, e) product or brand imagery, f) attitude toward the advertisements, g) empathy with characters in the advertisements, h) identification with people in the advertisements, i) degree of immersion into the presented environments in the advertisements, and f) feelings and emotions regarding the company, product, and/or brand. Informational objectives often include creating or changing audience members' a) product or brand beliefs, b) copy-point registration, and c) slogan memorability. Behavioral objectives often include changing a variety of simple, short-term behaviors on the part of audience members (e.g., calling a phone number listed in an advertisement, visiting a web site listed in an advertisement). More often, behavioral objectives include creating or changing audience members' propensity or intention to engage in future desired behaviors.

The next step in designing measures of effectiveness involves a thorough consideration of the intended target audience. Naturally, this step will be thought through completely before creating the desired communication objectives, but it is worth considering again when designing measures. Different target audiences will bring different sets of experiences with the product in question. Moreover, different target audiences will possess differing levels of knowledge and skills regarding the product and product environment. What this means is that careful attention must be paid to item wording and phrasing; and to the assumptions underlying scale-usage (e.g., whether or not to use neutral mid-points, or non-forced "don't know" categories).

A next step in designing measures of effectiveness involves a consideration of the competitive reference surrounding the advertising. Strategically, advertising is designed

to provide the advertiser with a competitive advantage, and audience members will often consider the ad claims in light of competitive options open to them. What this means is that careful consideration must be given to using comparative measures of advertising effectiveness. For example, one of the communication objectives might be to produce positive brand attitudes in the minds of the target audience. Alternatively, the communication objective might be reframed to produce target brand attitudes that are more positive than those attitudes audience members hold for a competing brand. It is our opinion that comparative measures should be used whenever appropriate, for they offer greater strategic value to advertising decision-makers.

A final step in designing measures of effectiveness involves a thorough consideration of the predominant advertising form(s) being used throughout the campaign. Broadly speaking, the form of advertisements varies along a continuum of pure-narrative (e.g., commercial dramas with a complete storyline and full characterization), to pure-argumentative (e.g., commercial voice-overs with factual graphics and overt linear logic). When using advertisements with a strong drama component, including characters engaged in story experiences, effectiveness measures such as empathy and character identification would likely be employed; one of the key objectives of drama is to produce high levels of experienced empathy and character identification in their audiences. However, if the advertisements contain a strong argumentative component, measures of empathy would be inappropriate since there are no characters with which audience members can empathize. Instead, argumentative forms generally demand the use of benefit-claim belief measures.

### **Alternative Measures**

It is difficult to propose a set of alternative measures of advertising effectiveness precisely because the viability of these measures depends upon how well they address defined communication objectives. As such, the alternative measures detailed here should be treated as examples of measures that could be employed, but need not be employed for every campaign. The measures described here are "alternative" in the sense that, as far as we could ascertain, the Navy does not currently nor has it employed them to measure advertising effectiveness. The measures described here have been used across a variety of commercial applications, and diagnostic issues concerning reliability, discriminant, and convergent validity have been satisfactorily addressed by those who created the measures. Each of these measures is provided in the Appendix.

**Viewer Response Profile (VRP).** The VRP is one of the more widely used ad effectiveness batteries in industry. It is particularly well suited for teasing out the drivers of attitude-toward-the-ad, and parsing the transformational versus informational dimensionality of viewer ad responses. We should note that the VRP dimension entitled "empathy" is not a viable measure of empathy, per se (see instead section "Viewer Empathy in Response to Drama Ads").

**Personal Involvement Index for Advertising (PIIA).** The PIIA measure, or variants thereof, is another widely used measure of advertising effectiveness. This measure captures the degree of personal relevance audience members attach to the advertising

message. It is an especially useful measure to use when assessing the efficacy of advertising executions across various target audiences.

**Persuasive Disclosure Inventory (PDI).** The PDI is not widely used, but is nonetheless useful for assessing viewer's reactions to various leverage tactics in advertising (appeals to information credibility, logic, or emotions).

**Viewer Empathy in Response to Drama Ads (VEDA).** The VEDA scale measures viewers' state (as opposed to trait) empathy in response to drama advertisements. The measure should only be employed when the advertisements in question are predominantly drama in form, and contain characters with which audience members can empathize. This measure is particularly useful when the communication objectives include "providing audience members with insight into product-use experiences."

**Character Identification.** Character identification measures the degree to which viewers believe they share similarities to the ad characters (varying from simple identification with overt physical characteristics to strong identification with deep value structures). This is an especially important measure to use when the advertising is attempting to create a strong referent appeal.

**Attitude Measures.** Attitude measures are widely used throughout industry as a primary measure of advertising effectiveness. Thus, we are quite surprised to learn that the Navy does not currently employ such measures as a routine assessment of their own advertising. We have provided a variety of different attitude measures, all or some of which may be employed as per the stated communication objectives.

**Behavioral Intention Measures.** Behavioral intention measures are also widely used throughout industry as a primary measure of advertising effectiveness. Again, we are quite surprised to learn that the Navy does not currently employ such measures as a routine assessment of their own advertising. We have provided a variety of different behavioral intention measures, all or some of which may be employed as per the stated communication objectives.

**Comparative Beliefs.** Comparative belief measures (as well as comparative attitude measures) are widely used throughout industry to assess the competitive advantage advertising provides. The measures listed in the Appendix have not been used to our knowledge. They are included as an example of the kind of comparative belief measures that could be created, as per the stated communication objectives as well as the stated competitive reference.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Our overall recommendation is that the Navy begin to assertively assess and measure the effectiveness of their advertising creative. The Navy must be able to determine if their advertising messages are persuasive and are, in fact, accomplishing their planned communication objectives. The Navy cannot continue merely to evaluate ad awareness and slogan recall while ignoring the content of their supposed persuasive messages. Recruiting young men and women into the Navy is a persuasive task, not a mere "awareness or recall task."

In addition, we recommend that the Navy actively evaluate the effectiveness of their advertising before media distribution.

Advertising assessment and effectiveness is a scientific process of measurement and analysis aimed at improving the quality of the communication product. Ego involvement, political posturing, and job-related anxiety should hold no sway over this essential process.

## References

- 1999 NAES Topline: Wave XXXIV (Written Summary to CNRC by BBDO), July.
- 2000 NAES Topline: Wave XXXV (PowerPoint Summary to CNRC by BBDO), July.
- Boller, Gregory W. (1988), *Narrative Advertisements: Stories About Consumption Experiences and their Effects on Meanings about Products*, unpublished doctoral dissertation: Penn State University.
- Dertouzos, James N. (1989), "The Effects of Military Advertising: Evidence from the Advertising Mix Test, A Rand Note: N-2907-FMP.
- Feltham, Tammi S. (1994), "Assessing Viewer Judgment of Advertisements and Vehicles: Scale Development and Validation," in Chris T. Allen and Deborah Roedder-John (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research* (Vol. 21, pp. 531-535), Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Mills, C. Wright (1956), *The Power Elite*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Schlenger, Mary (1979), "A Profile of Responses to Commercials," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 19, 37-46.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith Lynne (1994), "The Personal Involvement Inventory: Reduction, Revision, and Application to Advertising," *Journal of Advertising*, 23(4), 59-70.

# **Appendix**

## **Measures of Advertising Effectiveness**

## **Viewer Response Profile (Schlinger, 1979)**

### **Items:**

#### **Entertainment**

1. The commercial was lots of fun to watch and listen to.
2. I thought it was clever and entertaining.
3. The enthusiasm of the commercial is catching—it picks you up.
4. The ad wasn't just selling the product—it was entertaining me and I appreciate that.
5. The characters (or persons) in the commercial capture your attention.
6. It's the kind of commercial that keeps running through your mind after you've seen it.
7. I just laughed at it—I thought it was funny and good.

#### **Confusion**

8. It was distracting – trying to watch the screen and listen to the words at the same time.
9. It required a lot of effort to follow the commercial.
10. It was too complex. I wasn't sure what was going on.
11. I was so busy watching the screen, I didn't listen to the talk.

#### **Relevant News**

12. The commercial gave me a new idea.
13. The commercial reminded me that I'm dissatisfied with what I'm using now and I'm looking for something better.
14. I learned something from the commercial that I didn't know before.
15. The commercial told me about a new product I think I'd like to try.
16. During the commercial I thought that the product might be useful to me.

#### **Brand Reinforcement**

17. That's a good brand and I wouldn't hesitate recommending it to others.
18. I know that the advertised brand is a dependable, reliable one.

**Empathy**

19. The commercial was very realistic—that is, true to life.
20. I felt that the commercial was acting out what I feel at times.
21. I felt as though I were right there in the commercial experiencing the same thing.
22. That's my idea – the kind of life the commercial showed.
23. I liked the commercial because it was personal and intimate.

**Familiarity**

24. This kind of commercial has been done many times—it's the same old thing.
25. I've seen this commercial so many times—I'm tired of it.
26. I think this is an unusual commercial. I'm not sure I've seen another like it. (RC)

**Alienation**

27. What they showed didn't demonstrate the claims they were making about the product.
28. The ad didn't have anything to do with me or my needs.
29. The commercial did not show me anything that would make me want to use their products.
30. The commercial made exaggerated claims. The product would not live up to what they said or implied.
31. It was an unrealistic ad—very far fetched.
32. The commercial irritated me—it was annoying.

**Format:**

Likert format; 7-point; "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"



## **Personal Involvement Index for Advertising (PIIA) (Zaichkowsky, 1994)**

### **Items:**

Important	--	Unimportant (RC)
Boring	--	Interesting
Relevant	--	Irrelevant (RC)
Exciting	--	Unexciting (RC)
Means Nothing	--	Means a Lot to Me
Appealing	--	Unappealing (RC)
Fascinating	--	Mundane (RC)
Worthless	--	Valuable
Involving	--	Uninvolving (RC)
Not Needed	--	Needed

### **Format:**

Semantic Differential; 7-point

## Persuasive Disclosure Inventory (PDI) (Feltham, 1994)

### Items:

#### Ethos

Unbelievable	--	Believable
Not Credible	--	Credible
Not Trustworthy	--	Trustworthy
Unreliable	--	Reliable
Undependable	--	Dependable

#### Logos

Not Rational	--	Rational
Not Informative	--	Informative
Not Factual	--	Factual
Not Knowledgeable	--	Knowledgeable
Not Logical	--	Logical

#### Pathos

Does Not Affect My Feelings	--	Affects My Feelings
Does Not Touch Me Emotionally	--	Touches Me Emotionally
Is Not Stimulating	--	Is Stimulating
Does Not Reach Out To Me	--	Reaches Out To Me
Is Not Stirring	--	Is Stirring
Is Not Moving	--	Is Moving
Is Not Exciting	--	Is Exciting

### Format:

Semantic Differential; 7-point

# **Viewer Empathy in Response to Drama Ads (VEDA)**

**(Boller, 1988)**

## **Items:**

1. I felt as though I were right there in the commercial, experiencing the same thing.
2. I tried to understand the characters in the commercial by imagining how things look from their perspective.
3. I really got involved with the feelings of the characters in the commercial.
4. While watching the commercial, I felt as if the characters' thoughts and feelings were my own.
5. While watching the commercial, I could easily put myself in the place of one of the leading characters.
6. While watching the commercial, I imagined how I would feel if the events in the story were happening to me.
7. While watching the commercial, I tried to imagine what the characters were thinking.
8. While watching the commercial, I viewed the story objectively and did not get emotionally involved.
9. I became very involved in what the characters were experiencing throughout the story.
10. While watching the commercial, I experienced many of the same feelings that the characters portrayed.

## **Format:**

Likert format; 6-point; "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"

## **Character Identification (Boller, 1988)**

### **Items:**

1. The character and I are similar in how we dress.
2. The character and I are similar in physical appearance.
3. The character and I are similar in how we talk.
4. The character and I are similar in how we behave.
5. The character and I use the same products.
6. The character and I relate to other people in similar ways.
7. The character and I share many of the same interests and opinions.
8. The character and I share many of the same goals and aspirations.
9. The character and I share many of the same values.

### **Format:**

Likert format; 6-point; "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"

## Attitude Measures (No Reference – Widely Used)

**Scales: Note – Adapted for assessing Navy advertisements.**

### Attitude toward the Navy:

What are your overall feelings about the Navy?

Good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Bad
Dislike	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Like
Positive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Negative

### Attitude toward joining the Navy:

What are your overall feelings about joining the Navy?

Good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Bad
Dislike	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Like
Positive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Negative

### Attitude toward recommending the Navy to another:

What are your overall feelings about recommending the Navy to a friend/family member?

Good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Bad
Dislike	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Like
Positive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Negative

### Attitude toward the ad:

What are your overall feelings about the advertisement?

Good	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Bad
Dislike	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 Like
Positive	7	6	5	4	3	2	1 Negative

### Format:

Semantic Differential; 7-point

## **Behavioral Intention Measures (No Reference – Widely Used)**

**Scales:** Note – Adapted for assessing Navy advertisements.

### **Intention to seek additional information about the Navy:**

How likely is it that you will seek additional information about the Navy within the next month?

Extremely Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Likely

### **Intention to contact a Navy recruiter:**

How likely is it that you will contact a Navy recruiter within the next month?

Extremely Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Likely

### **Intention to join the Navy:**

How likely is it that you will join the Navy within the next month?

Extremely Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Likely

### **Format:**

Semantic Differential; 7-point

**Comparative Beliefs**  
**(Adapted from the July 2000 NAES Questionnaire**  
**Life Goals Section [Sec. 13])**

**Items:**

1. Compared to the Army, the Navy better prepares you to do something meaningful with your life.
2. Compared to the Army, the Navy better allows you to develop yourself to your full potential.
3. Compared to the Army, the Navy gives you more opportunity for adventure and excitement.
4. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers more discipline in your life.
5. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers a better opportunity to work with a high quality organization.
6. Compared to the Army, the Navy gives you more opportunity to earn a lot of money in the future.
7. Compared to the Army, the Navy trains you better to become an effective leader.
8. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers more opportunity to live and work in a stable environment.
9. Compared to the Army, the Navy better prepares you for the world of tomorrow.
10. Compared to the Army, the Navy better prepares you for a secure future.
11. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers you a better opportunity to gain a lot of responsibility at an early age.
12. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers you a better opportunity to serve your country.
13. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers you a better chance to travel and see the world.
14. Compared to the Army, the Navy better allows you to be associated with an organization rich in heritage and tradition.
15. Compared to the Army, the Navy more encourages you to live for today and not worry about the future.
16. Compared to the Army, the Navy will make you more respected by your family and friends.
17. Compared to the Army, the Navy will better prepare you for a career you can be proud of.

18. Compared to the Army, the Navy is better able to help you pay for a college education.
19. Compared to the Army, the Navy is more of an organization where equal opportunities exist for both men and women.
20. Compared to the Army, the Navy is more of an organization where equal opportunities exist for everyone, regardless of their ethnic group.
21. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers you a better opportunity to develop friendships.
22. Compared to the Army, the Navy provides a wider variety of interesting jobs.
23. Compared to the Army, it is more likely that I will meet the Navy's admission requirements.
24. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers more opportunity for rapid advancement.
25. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers more opportunity for high-tech training.
26. Compared to the Army, the Navy offers more opportunity for training in nuclear energy.
27. Compared to the Army, the Navy is more of an organization that stresses honor, courage, and commitment.

**Format:**

Likert format; Unforced; 7-point; "Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree"



## **Distribution List**

Commander, Navy Recruiting Command (Code N53 (3), Code N531 (2), N533 (2))

Chief of Naval Personnel (Code N1H)

Commander, Navy Personnel Command (PERS-13, PERS-13C)

University of Memphis (Dr. Greg Boller) (3)